

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Weshington, D.C. 20231

	L	ŚE	RIAL NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO	
		0:	3/019,011	02/18/93	DEAN	T 1158C	
						FORD, J EXAMINER	
					12M2/0411	- Chiefy	
LOWE, PRICE, LE 99 CANAL CENTER						ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER	
			EXANDRIA,		. 551.12 555	9	
			•			1202	
						DATE MAILED: 04/11/94	
	CO	IS B MMIS	communication from the SIONER OF PATENTS	examiner in charge of AND THADEMARKS	your application		
This application has been examined Responsive to communication filed on 2/2/1/ This action is made final.							
A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire month(s), days from the date of this letter.							
Fallure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. 35 U.S.C. 133							
F	Part I		THE FOLLOWING	ATTACHMENT(8) A	RE PART OF THIS ACTION:	•	
_	. 1 Notice of References Cited by Examiner, PTO-892. 2. ☐ Notice re-Patent Drawing, PTO-948.						
	3.		Notice of Art Cited	by Applicant, PTO-1	1449 4. 🖸 Notice of it	nformal Patent Application, Form PTO-152.	
	5.	ш	information on How	v to Effect Drawing C	Changes, PTO-1474. 6		
Part II SUMMARY OF ACTION							
1. DCiaims 1-3, 5, 6, 1820, 23, 24, 27-29 are pending in the app						are pending in the application.	
			Of the above	alaima			
		_				are withdrawn from consideration.	
	2.		Claims		····	have been cancelled.	
	3.		Claims		, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	ard though.	
	4.	X	Claims /3, 5, 6, 18 20, 23, 24, 27 29 #32 ere rejected.				
	6.		Claims		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	are objected to.	
	6.		Cialms		arc	subject to restriction or election requirement.	
	. 7. This application has been filed with informal drawings under 97.C.F.R. 1.85 which are acceptable for examination purpor					acceptable for examination purposes.	
8. Formal drawings are required in response to this Office action.					,		
·							
	9.	ш	are acceptable	ibstitute drawings he s. D not acceptable	ive been received on e (see explanation or Notice re Patent Drawing	. Under 37 C.F.R. 1.84 these drawings	
		_				_	
	10.	ш			heet(s) of drawings, filed on	_ has (have) been approved by the	
		_		•	,	_	
	11.				on, has been 🔲 appro		
	12;		Acknowledgment is	made of the claim for	or priority under U.S.C. 119. The certified copy	has Deen received not been received	
	1		Deen filed in par	rent application, seri	al no; filed on .		
. '	13.		Since this application	on appears to be in c	condition for allowance except for formal matt	978. Drosacution as to the marks is closed in	
			accordance with the	accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayte, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.			
•	14.		Other				

Serial No. 08/019,011 Art Unit 1202

Applicants response of Feb. 22, 1994, is noted.

The terminal disclaimer of Feb. 28, 1994, has been entered under 37 CFR 1.321.

The claims in the application are claims 1-3, 5, 6, 18-20, 23, 24, 27-29 and 32.

All claims are rejected as not being patentably distinct from the claims of applicants U.S. Patent 5,153,192. Compare the claim 1 of the patent to claim 19 here. Compare claims 4-11 of the patent to claims 20, 23, 24, 27-29 and 32 here. No patentable distinction is seen. See the last Office Action.

The third compound from the end of claim 19 is a 2-propyl of the same compound that is the 2-methyl, that is the first compound of claim 1 of U.S. Patent 5,153,192. This is extremely close, in an otherwise identical molecule, for the same use. The first compound of claim 19 is extremely close to the 2(2-methoxy ethyl) compound that is penultimate in the list of claim 1 of US 5,153,192 -

- that is an ethyl vs. propyl variation. Next adjacent compounds are obvious from one another. A terminal disclaimer is minimally required.

Serial No. 08/019,011

Art Unit 1202

Claims 1-3, 5, 6, 18-20, 23, 24, 27-29 and 32 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, and 4-11 of U.S. Patent No. 5,153,192. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because next adjacent compounds are being claimed here.

The obviousness-type double patenting rejection is a judicially established doctrine based upon public policy and is primarily intended to prevent prolongation of the patent term by prohibiting claims in a second patent not patentably distinct from claims in a first patent. In re Vogel, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970). A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.321(b) would overcome an actual or provisional rejection on this ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 C.F.R. § 1.78(d).

A facsimile center has been established in Group 1200, room 3C10. The hours of operation are Monday through Friday, 8:45 AM to 4:45 PM. The telecopier numbers for accessing the facsimile machine are (703) 308-4556 or 305-3592.

Ford: ach April 07, 1994

PRIMARY EXAMINER
GROUP 120